

receiving the packet, generating a multicast session table entry based on the list of downstream virtual networks and the multicast group membership.” As an example, Applicant notes that the cited portion of Acharya et al. fails to disclose anything relating to “generating a multicast session table...”

Additionally, The Examiner cites col. 9, lines 10-55, and Figure 7 of Acharya et al. as disclosing the step of “downloading the multicast session table entry to the edge devices.” As an example, Applicant notes that the cited portion of Acharya et al. fails to disclose anything relating to “downloading the multicast session table entry to the edge devices.” Thus, Applicant submits that Acharya et al. fail to anticipate claims 1 or 21. Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 1 and 21 are in condition for allowance.

Regarding claims 10, 30, and 11, the Examiner cites Figures 1, 2, and 9 and col. 7, lines 15-65, of Acharya et al. as disclosing certain steps. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Applicant submits that none of Figures 1, 2, or 9 disclose the elements of the claimed invention as recited in claims 10, 30, or 11. Moreover, Applicant submits that the cited portion of col. 7 of Acharya et al. also fails to disclose the elements of the claimed invention as recited in claims 10, 30, or 11. For example, Applicant can find no evidence of “generating a group affiliation table...” in the cited portions of Acharya et al. As another example, Applicant can find no evidence of “generating a multicast session table entry...” in the cited portions of Acharya et al. Thus, Applicant submits that Acharya et al. fail to anticipate claims 10, 30, or 11. Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 10, 30, and 11 are in condition for allowance.

Regarding claims 2, 13, 14, 22, 32, and 33, the Examiner cites Figure 10 of Acharya et al. as disclosing “generating the multicast session table entry to include ports of the edge devices that are coupled to at least one of a legacy router and a host.” Applicant respectfully disagrees. Applicant notes that Figure 10 of Acharya et al. includes only ATM switch 1405, core ATM network 1401, and edge switches 1402, 1403, 1404, and 1405, but does not include the elements of the cited claims. For example, no evidence of “generating the multicast session table entry...” appears to exist in Figure 10 of Acharya et al. As another example, no evidence of “downloading the multicast session table entry to edge devices” appears to exist in Figure 10 of Acharya et al. Thus, Applicant submits that Acharya et al. fail to anticipate claims 2, 13, 14, 22, 32, and 33. Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 2, 13, 14, 22, 32, and 33 are in condition for allowance.

Regarding claims 3, 12, 23, and 31, the Examiner cites col. 9, lines 20-25 and lines 50-67, of Acharya et al. as disclosing certain steps. Applicant respectfully disagrees. For example, the cited portion of Acharya et al. appears to fail to disclose receiving..., interpreting..., and sending..., as recited

in the relevant claims. Thus, Applicant submits that Acharya et al. fail to anticipate claims 3, 12, 23, and 31. Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 3, 12, 23, and 31 are in condition for allowance.

Regarding claims 4, 15, 24, and 34, the Examiner cites col. 9, lines 50-67, of Acharya et al. as disclosing certain steps. Applicant respectfully disagrees. For example, the cited portion of Acharya et al. appears to fail to disclose providing..., receiving..., and suppressing..., as recited in the relevant claims. Thus, Applicant submits that Acharya et al. fail to anticipate claims 4, 15, 24, and 34. Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 4, 15, 24, and 34 are in condition for allowance.

Regarding claims 5, 16, 25, and 35, the Examiner cites col. 7, lines 30-55, of Acharya et al. as disclosing certain steps. Applicant respectfully disagrees. For example, Applicant can find no evidence in the cited portions of Acharya et al. of any teaching related to receiving a leave message..., wherein the leave message indicates that a member desires to leave a multicast group. Nor can Applicant find evidence in the cited portions of Acharya et al. of any teaching related to the other claim limitations of the relevant claims. Thus, Applicant submits that Acharya et al. fail to anticipate claims 5, 16, 25, and 35. Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 5, 15, 25, and 35 are in condition for allowance.

Regarding claims 6, 17, 26, and 36, the Examiner cites Figure 8 of Acharya et al. as disclosing certain steps. Applicant respectfully disagrees. For example, Applicant can find no evidence in Figure 8 of Acharya et al. or the accompanying description of any teaching of “when a report is not received in response to the group specific membership query, determining whether at least one other port of a virtual subnetwork is supporting the multicast group.” Thus, Applicant submits that Acharya et al. fail to anticipate claims 6, 17, 26, and 36. Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 6, 17, 26, and 36 are in condition for allowance.

Regarding claims 7, 18, 27, and 37, the Examiner cites col. 12, lines 5-10, of Acharya et al. as disclosing “a method of receiving a leave message (IGMP) via a port of one of the edge devices; and switching group affiliation of the port of one of the edge devices in accordance with the leave message.” Applicant respectfully disagrees. For example, Applicant can find no evidence in the cited portion of Acharya et al. of any teaching related to “receiving a leave message (IGMP)....” As another example, Applicant can find no evidence in the cited portion of Acharya et al. of any teaching related to “switching group affiliation of the port of the of the edge devices in accordance with the leave

Application No: 09/368,651

message.” Thus, Applicant submits that Acharya et al. fail to anticipate claims 7, 18, 27, and 37. Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 7, 18, 27, and 37 are in condition for allowance.

Regarding claims 8, 9, 19, 20, 28, 29, 38, and 39, the Examiner cites col. 12, lines 35-65, of Acharya et al. as disclosing certain steps. Applicant respectfully disagrees. For example, Applicant submits that Acharya et al. fails to disclose “receiving reports from the ports for each of the plurality of virtual subnetworks.” As another example, Applicant submits that Acharya et al. fails to disclose “upon receiving reports per query interval, forwarding up to a given number of reports to the legacy router.” Thus, Applicant submits that Acharya et al. fail to anticipate claims 8, 9, 19, 20, 28, 29, 38, and 39. Therefore Applicant submits that claims 8, 9, 19, 20, 28, 29, 38, and 39 are in condition for allowance.

In conclusion, Applicant has overcome all of the Office’s rejections, and early notice of allowance to this effect is earnestly solicited. If, for any reason, the Office is unable to allow the Application on the next Office Action, and believes a telephone interview would be helpful, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

12/27/2002

Date



Ross D. Snyder, Reg. No. 37,730  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Ross D. Snyder & Associates, Inc.  
115 Wild Basin Road, Suite 107  
Austin, Texas 78746  
(512) 347-9223 (phone)  
(512) 347-9224 (fax)